



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,187	12/16/2005	Satoshi Araki	277514US6PCT	3916
22850	7590	09/29/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
STU, SARAH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2131				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/561,187

**Applicant(s)**

ARAKI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Sarah Su

**Art Unit**

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11,14,19,20 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/17/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

#### ***Priority***

2. The claim for priority from PCT/JP04/07014 filed on 18 May 2004 is duly noted.
3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### ***Specification***

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in page 7, line 2: "in the a service" should read –in the service–.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11, 14, 19-20, and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. In claim 1, line 5: " the service utilizing apparatus" lacks antecedent basis;
  - b. In claim 2, line 12: "the contents data" lacks antecedent basis;

- c. In claim 4, line 7: "apparatus is to be" should read –apparatus are to be–;
- d. In claim 5, line 3: "the another apparatus name receiving step" is unclear if it relates to "an apparatus name receiving step";
- e. In claim 6, line 7: "the contents data" lacks antecedent basis;
- f. In claim 6, line 8: "the other service utilizing apparatus" lacks antecedent basis;
- g. In claims 7 and 8, line 3: "user identification information" is unclear if it relates to "user identification information" (claim 1, line 4);
- h. In claims 7 and 8, lines 3-4: "a password" is unclear if it relates to "a password" (claim 1, line 5);
- i. In claims 7, line 7: "the authentication reply" lacks antecedent basis;
- j. In claim 8, line 5: "a service" is unclear if it relates to "a service" (claim 1, line 4);
- k. In claim 8, lines 6-7: "the authentication reply" lacks antecedent basis;
- l. In claim 11, line 6: "the service utilizing apparatus" lacks antecedent basis;
- m. In claim 14, line 11: "the authentication results" lacks antecedent basis;
- n. In claims 19 and 20, line 3: "user identification information" is unclear if it relates to "user identification information" (claim 12, line 5);
- o. In claims 19 and 20, line 4: "a password" is unclear if it relates to "a password" (claim 12, line 7);
- p. In claim 19, lines 7-8: "the authentication reply" lacks antecedent basis;
- q. In claim 20, line 7: "the authentication reply" lacks antecedent basis;

- r. In claim 23, lines 4-5: "a service utilizing apparatus" is unclear if it relates to "a service utilizing apparatus" (claim 23, lines 1-2).

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Drawings***

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 74 (Figure 3), SP1000 (Figure 19). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 12 recites the limitation "a registering step of registering the user identification information, the password, and the apparatus name of the registration information as associated among them" in lines 9-11. It is unclear as to what "them" refers.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims are drawn to a computer program per se. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se are abstract instructions. Computer programs are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. As such, these claims are not directed to one of the statutory categories of invention (See MPEP 2106.01), but are directed to nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

Please note that computer programs embodied on a computer readable medium or other structure, which would permit the functionality of the program to be realized, would

be directed to a product and be within a statutory category of invention, so long as the computer readable medium is not disclosed as non-statutory subject matter per se (electromagnetic signals or carrier waves).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imazu (US 2002/0087892 A1).

As to claims 1, 10-11, and 23-24, Imazu discloses a system and method for authentication, the system and method having:

**a registration information transmitting step of transmitting registration information which is externally input and includes user identification information (i.e. login identifier) for use in utilizing a service in the service utilizing apparatus, a password corresponding to the user identification information, and an apparatus name (i.e. registration identifier) of the service utilizing apparatus to a management apparatus for managing the service utilizing apparatus (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13);**

**a registration completion information receiving step of receiving registration completion information (i.e. login screen display) transmitted**

**from the management apparatus after completing registration with the user identification information, the password, and the apparatus name associated in the registration information (0065, lines 5-9; 0072, lines 1-3).**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu. As to claim 13, Imazu discloses:

**characterized in that in the registering step, first user identification information, a first password, and a first apparatus name received from a**



**first service utilizing apparatus are associated and registered** (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13),

but does not explicitly disclose:

**a second user identification information, a second password, and a second apparatus name identical to the first apparatus name are received from a second service utilizing apparatus, and the second user identification information is different from the user identification information, then the second user identification information, the second password, and the second apparatus name are associated with one another and registered.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a second user on the same terminal using different user information since it was known in the art that personal authentication using user name and password is needed in a multi-user computer system or network to verify that the communicating party is real, as shown in Imazu (0006, lines 15-23).

16. Claims 2-8 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aboulhosn et al. (US 2004/0068524 A1 and Aboulhosn hereinafter).

As to claims 2 and 14, Imazu discloses:

**an authentication request information receiving step of receiving authentication request information comprising the user identification**

**information (i.e. login identifier) and the password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0014, lines 11-14);**

**an authentication step of performing an authentication process based on the received user identification information and password (0077, lines 1-6);**

**an authentication results transmitting step of transmitting the authentication results (i.e. URL of registration screen) of the authentication process to the service utilizing apparatus as a result of transmitting the authentication results to the service utilizing apparatus (0072, lines 1-3);**

Imazu does not disclose:

**a contents identification information receiving step of receiving contents identification information about at least predetermined contents data for request of the contents data transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus;**

**a contents data transmitting step of transmitting the contents data corresponding to the received contents identification information to the service utilizing apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses a system and method for peer-to-peer file sharing, the system and method having:

**a contents identification information receiving step of receiving contents identification information (i.e. request for content/virtual file) about at least predetermined contents data for request of the contents data transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0013, lines 24-27);**

**a contents data transmitting step of transmitting the contents data corresponding to the received contents identification information to the service utilizing apparatus (0013, lines 26-27).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transmitting data according to an identifier. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that transmitting data that is stored at a location reduces the need for centralized file storage (0003, lines 9-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by transmitting data according to an identifier in order to allow data to be stored at different locations while allowing them to be accessed.

As to claims 3 and 15, Imazu does not disclose:

**an apparatus name request information transmitting step of transmitting apparatus name request information about a request for a name of another apparatus registered as associated with another user identification information different from the user identification information to the service utilizing apparatus;**

**an apparatus name receiving step of receiving the name of another apparatus transmitted according to the apparatus name request information from the management apparatus;**  
**a displaying step of displaying the received name of another apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**an apparatus name request information transmitting step of transmitting apparatus name request information about a request for a name of another apparatus registered as associated with another user identification information different from the user identification information to the service utilizing apparatus (0015, lines 21-23);**

**an apparatus name receiving step of receiving the name of another apparatus transmitted according to the apparatus name request information from the management apparatus (0014, lines 2-6);**

**a displaying step of displaying the received name of another apparatus (0020, lines 3-7).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by receiving and displaying another apparatus name. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that

receiving and displaying other apparatus names allows files to be shared with groups (0014, lines 3-4) and for a user to view the shared file structure (0019, lines 1-3). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by receiving and displaying another apparatus name in order to allow for files to be shared and for the file structure to be viewed.

As to claims 4 and 16, Imazu does not disclose:

**a disclosure setting information transmitting step of receiving disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the apparatus names of the plurality of service utilizing apparatuses transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus are to be published;**

**a disclosure setting information registering step of registering the received disclosure setting information and the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as associated with each other.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**a disclosure setting information transmitting step of receiving disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the apparatus names of the plurality of service utilizing apparatuses transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus are to be published (i.e. accept or decline) (0016, lines 17-21);**

**a disclosure setting information registering step of registering the received disclosure setting information and the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as associated with each other (0016, lines 20-21).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by registering an apparatus with disclosure information. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that registering an apparatus with information regarding its group membership ensures that a computer system is authorized to be a member (0016, lines 5-7). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by registering an apparatus with membership information in order to ensure that a computer is authorized to be a member.

As to claims 5 and 17, Imazu does not disclose:

**the another apparatus name receiving step receives the name of another apparatus set to be published among the names of another apparatuses registered as associated with the other user identification information.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**the another apparatus name receiving step receives the name of another apparatus set to be published among the names of another apparatuses registered as associated with the other user identification information (0016, lines 20-21).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by receiving the name of another apparatus to be registered. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claims 4 and 16 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu.

As to claims 6 and 18, Imazu does not disclose:

**a distribution request information receiving step of receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester of predetermined contents data and comprises the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus, contents identification information about the contents data, and the other apparatus name of the other service utilizing apparatus which is a provider of the contents data;**

**a distribution contents data transmitting step of transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the other service utilizing apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**a distribution request information receiving step of receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester (i.e. file sharing system) of predetermined contents data and comprises the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus, contents identification information about the contents data, and the other apparatus name of the other service utilizing apparatus which is a provider of the contents data (0013, lines 24-27);**

**a distribution contents data transmitting step of transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the other service utilizing apparatus (0013, lines 26-27).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transferring information to a requested apparatus. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that providing a copy of a file to an accessing member allows peer-to-peer file sharing (0013, lines 13-14), reducing the need for a centralized storage space (0003, lines 9-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by transferring data to a requested system in order to allow file sharing and reduce the amount of centralized storage space needed.



As to claim 7, Imazu discloses:

**a step of transmitting user identification information and a password to the management apparatus (0014, lines 10-13).**

Imazu does not disclose:

**a step of displaying information about an apparatus name corresponding to the user identification information and the password in the authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**a step of displaying information about an apparatus name (i.e. computer system identifier) corresponding to the user identification information and the password in the authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus (0020, lines 3-7).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by displaying information about an apparatus. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that sharing apparatus information allows other group members to be notified of newly shared or modified files (0013, lines 27-29). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would

have improved the teachings of Imazu by sharing apparatus information in order to update file sharing information with group members.

As to claim 8, Imazu discloses:

**a step of transmitting user identification information and a password to the management apparatus (0014, lines 10-13).**

Imazu does not disclose:

**a step of displaying information about a service used in the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus in the authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus according to identification information about the service;**

**a step of transmitting information for permission of deleting the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus according to an external input.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**a step of displaying information about a service used in the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus in the authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus according to identification information about the service (0019, lines 1-5);**

**a step of transmitting information for permission of deleting the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus according to an external input (0018, lines 1-3).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by displaying file sharing information and transmitting apparatus deletion information. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that displaying file sharing information provides a user interface for the shared file structure (0019, lines 11-13) and providing deletion information allows file synchronization to be suspended (0018, line 6). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by displaying service information and providing deletion information in order to provide a user interface and suspend file synchronization.

As to claim 19, Imazu discloses:

**a step of authenticating user identification information and a password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0077, lines 1-6).**

Imazu does not disclose:

**a step of transmitting information about an apparatus name corresponding to the user identification information and the password to the service utilizing apparatus together with the authentication reply corresponding to the authentication.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**a step of transmitting information about an apparatus name corresponding to the user identification information and the password to the service utilizing apparatus together with the authentication reply corresponding to the authentication (0015, lines 4-7; 0016, lines 20-23).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transferring information about an apparatus with user information. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 7 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu.

As to claim 20, Imazu discloses:

**a step of authenticating user identification information and a password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0077, lines 1-6).**

Imazu does not disclose:

**a step of transmitting identification information about a service used by the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus together with the authentication reply to the service utilizing apparatus.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**a step of transmitting identification information about a service used by the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus together with the authentication reply to the service utilizing apparatus** (0016, lines 20-23; 0015, lines 4-7; 0019, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by sending information about file sharing (i.e. service) of an apparatus. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 8 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu.

17. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Oho et al. (US 2002/0184515 A1 and Oho hereinafter).

As to claims 9 and 21, Imazu in view of Aboulhosn discloses:

**an apparatus name storing step of storing the apparatus name** (0024, lines 21-23) in order to register the apparatus to ensure that it is authorized to be a member.

Imazu in view of Aboulhosn does not disclose:

**a deletion permission request information transmitting step of transmitting deletion permission request information about a request for permission of deleting the stored apparatus name to the management apparatus;**

**a deletion permission information receiving step of receiving deletion permission information for permission of deleting the apparatus name according to the deletion permission request information transmitted from the management apparatus;**

**an apparatus name deleting step of deleting the stored apparatus name according to the received deletion permission information;**

**a deletion request information transmitting step of transmitting, to the management apparatus, deletion request information about a request for deletion of the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus;**

**a deletion completion information receiving step of receiving deletion completion information transmitted after completing deleting the apparatus name and notification information according to the deletion request information from the management apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Aboulhosn, as evidenced by Oho.

Oho discloses a system and method for rights management, the system and method having:

**a deletion permission request information transmitting step of transmitting deletion permission request information about a request for permission of deleting the stored apparatus name to the management apparatus (0237, lines 9-11);**

**a deletion permission information receiving step of receiving deletion permission information for permission of deleting the apparatus name according to the deletion permission request information transmitted from the management apparatus (0238, lines 1-3);**

**an apparatus name deleting step of deleting the stored apparatus name according to the received deletion permission information (0239, lines 2-4);**

**a deletion request information transmitting step of transmitting, to the management apparatus, deletion request information about a request for deletion of the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus (0238, lines 6-11);**

**a deletion completion information receiving step of receiving deletion completion information transmitted after completing deleting the apparatus name and notification information according to the deletion request information from the management apparatus (0240, lines 2-7).**

Given the teaching of Oho, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn with the teachings of Oho by deleting an apparatus and sending a deletion confirmation. Oho recites motivation by disclosing that deleting an identifier from a rights database is used to control license information (0237, lines 3-6) and transmitting a deletion confirmation notifies the user that the identifier has been correctly deleted (0241, lines 8-11). It is obvious that the teachings of Oho would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn by deleting an apparatus name and providing deletion confirmation in order to control licensing information and confirm proper deletion.

18. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Bradee (US 2002/0095571 A1) and Satyavolu et al. (US 2003/0191964 A1 and Satyavolu hereinafter).

As to claim 22, Imazu in view of Aboulhosn does not disclose:

**an authentication session ID issuing step of the authentication server performing a user authentication process based on the user identification information and the password received in the authentication request information receiving step, issuing an authentication session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus when**



authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication session ID to the service utilizing apparatus;

an authentication ticket issuing step of the authentication server receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus;

a ticket authenticating step of the authentication server receiving from the server an authentication ticket transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server;

a service session ID issuing step of the server issuing a service session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus according to the received information about certification acknowledgement, and transmitting the issued service session ID to the service utilizing apparatus, characterized in that:

in the contents identification information receiving step, the server receives the service session ID and the contents identification information;

**in the contents data transmitting step, the authentication process is performed based on the received service session ID, and the contents data corresponding to the contents identification information is transmitted to the service using apparatus when the authentication is allowed.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Aboulhosn, as evidenced by Bradee.

Bradee discloses:

**an authentication session ID issuing step of the authentication server performing a user authentication process based on the user identification information and the password received in the authentication request information receiving step, issuing an authentication session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus when authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication session ID to the service utilizing apparatus (0041, lines 1-8);**

**a service session ID issuing step of the server issuing a service session ID which is a session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) with the service utilizing apparatus according to the received information about certification acknowledgement, and transmitting the issued service session ID to the service utilizing apparatus (0042, lines 2-3, 5-6), characterized in that:**

**in the contents identification information receiving step, the server receives the service session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) and the contents identification information (i.e. resource name) (0042, lines 17-19);**

**in the contents data transmitting step, the authentication process is performed based on the received service session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) , and the contents data corresponding to the contents identification information is transmitted to the service using apparatus when the authentication is allowed (i.e. permitting access) (0042, lines 13-16, 34-36).**

Given the teaching of Bradee, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhossn with the teachings of Bradee by using a session ID and service session ID in the authentication process to transmit data.

Bradee recites motivation by disclosing that using a session ID and surrogate ID to control access to data allows the data to be accessed for a certain amount of time before expiration (0043, lines 7-11). It is obvious that the teachings of Bradee would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhossn by using a session ID and surrogate ID to allow access to data in order to limit access to a certain amount of time.

Imazu in view of Aboulhossn and Bradee does not disclose:

**an authentication ticket issuing step of the authentication server receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the**

**server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus;**

**a ticket authenticating step of the authentication server receiving from the server an authentication ticket transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server;**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Aboulhoshn and Bradee, as evidenced by Satyavolu.

Satyavolu discloses:

**an authentication ticket issuing step of the authentication server receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket (i.e. UNS token) corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued**

**authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus** (0030, lines 1-7; 0031, lines 1-2);

**a ticket authenticating step of the authentication server receiving from the server an authentication ticket (i.e. UNS token) transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server** (0031, lines 7-9).

Given the teaching of Satyavolu, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and Bradee with the teachings of Satyavolu by using a ticket for authentication. Satyavolu recites motivation by disclosing that a ticket allows a user to avoid traditional authentication login requirements for a certain amount of time (0031, lines 9-12). It is obvious that the teachings of Satyavolu would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and Bradee by using a ticket in order to allow a user to bypass traditional login requirements for a given amount of time.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah Su/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Christopher A. Revak/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131